Application No. 09/992,582 Filed: November 16, 2001

Attorney Docket No.: 1152-2U

## **REMARKS**

These remarks are set forth in response to the Final Office Action mailed June 15, 2005 (the "Final Office Action"). As this amendment has been timely filed within the three-month shortened-statutory period neither a petition for an extension of time nor an extension fee is required. Presently, claims 1 through 20 are pending in the Patent Application. In the Office Action, each of claims 1 through 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,724,578 to Morinaga et al. (Morinaga) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0035697 to McCurdy et al (McCurdy).

In response, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections on the art based upon the following principals outlined during the helpful and most appreciated personal interview of September 13, 2005:

1. In the Applicants' invention, a "filter-driver" can receive incoming file I/O requests in the kernel layer such as file open and file save requests. The filter-driver can suppress the file I/O request and respond accordingly. For a file open, the filter-driver can retrieve digital rights management (DRM) information from the file, decrypt the file and pass the file to the authoring application while passing the DRM information to a DRM application along side the authoring application. For a file save, the filter-driver can encrypt the file and apply DRM information to the file. In both instances, the file I/O request itself must be suppressed.

Application No. 09/992,582

Filed: November 16, 2001

Attorney Docket No.: 1152-2U

2. Filter-drivers are low-level drivers often found within the file sub-system

of modern, windowing operating systems. Applications, by comparison, operate

at a higher level.

3. The suppression of the file I/O requests at the low level occurs so as to

provide seamless interoperability with the authoring application without requiring

access to the source code of the authoring application.

4. Both Morinaga and McCurdy lack a teaching directed to a "suppression"

of a file I/O request. Rather, only the receipt and processing of a file I/O request

is taught by Morinaga.

In view of the foregoing remarks and the helpful personal interview, the Applicants

respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections on the art based upon the Morinaga and

McCurdy references. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss any

matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

3

Application No. 09/992,582 Filed: November 16, 2001 Attorney Docket No.: 1152-2U

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2005

Steven M. Greenberg

Reg. No.: 44,725

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.

200 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 2040

Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

Customer No. 31292

Tel: (954) 828-1488

Fax: (954) 828-9122

25710